

***AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116***  
***U. S. Application No. 10/701,083***

***ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q76216***

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Submitted herewith please find a Replacement Sheet for FIG. 9, (inserting the word  
“Device” in S905).

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (FIG.9)

**REMARKS**

As a preliminary matter, the drawings are objected to because the box corresponding to operation S905 in Fig. 9 does not include the word “device” after the first recitation of the word “communication.” Applicants amend Fig. 9, as indicated herein, and it is believed that the Examiner’s drawing objection is obviated.

Claims 1-13 are all the claims pending in the present application. The Examiner now adds new references to support the rejections of claims 1-13. Specifically, claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Melpignano et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0003912) in view of new reference Davies et al. (US Patent No. 6,816,730). Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Melpignano in view of Davies as applied to claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13, and further in view of the following new references, Applicants admitted prior art (APA) and Coppage (US Patent No. 6,741,687).

**§103(a) Rejections (Melpignano/Davies) - Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13**

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner believes that Melpignano satisfies most of the features set forth in this claim, however the Examiner acknowledges that Melpignano fails to disclose wherein the first communication device transmits information of the wireless communication device (e.g. address and clock) to the second communication device when connection is established with the wireless communication device. However, the Examiner believes that Davies teaches the feature above and makes up for the deficiencies of Melpignano. In response, Applicants submit that Davies does not disclose or suggest at least, “wherein the first communication device, when connection is established with the wireless communication device, transmits to the second communication device information on an address and a clock of the wireless communication device which are determined based on the inquiry...,” as recited in claim 1. That is, Davies only discloses that a first beacon device (which allegedly corresponds to the claimed first communication device) transmits a received identifier to a selected second beacon device (which allegedly corresponds to the claimed second communication device).

Nowhere, however, does Davies specifically disclose or suggest that information on an address and clock of the wireless communication device is transmitted.

Furthermore, neither Melpignano nor Davies describes a hard hand-off procedure, as described in claim 1. A hard handoff is, for example, where a phone call in progress is redirected from one base station to another base station by first dropping a current radio link for a brief period of time before being connected to a different, stronger link. Both Melpignano (at numbered paragraph 80) and Davies (col. 2, lines 16-25) describe inventions involving soft hand-off procedures. On the other hand, the present invention, as recited in claim 1, for example, specifically recites a hard hand-off procedure.

Additionally, Applicants maintain the previously submitted arguments that paragraphs [14], [16], and [90] in Melpignano describe that the inquiry is performed between the APs, and that the paging is carried out based on the clock offsets between the APs. In contrast, claim 1 of the present invention recites that the inquiry is carried out between the first communication device (corresponding to the AP) and the wireless communication device (corresponding to the slave), and that the paging is performed based on the clock information of the wireless communication device. The Examiner did not respond to this previously submitted argument.

Applicants submit that independent claim 8 is patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-5, 7, 9-11 and 13 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 8.

Yet further, with respect to claims 4 and 11, Applicants maintain the previously submitted argument that the Examiner has utilized impermissible hindsight reasoning in concluding that it is common knowledge that a first communication device checks a connection state with a wireless connection communication every predetermined period, as Melpignano does not even mention that the claimed checking procedure occurs at every predetermined period. The Examiner does not respond to this previously submitted argument in the present Office Action.

§103(a) Rejections (Melpignano / Davies / APA / Coppage) - Claims 6 and 12

Applicants submit that dependent claims 6 and 12 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 8. The APA and Coppage do not make up for the deficiencies of Melpignano and Davies.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 9, 2006